

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/705,782	11/10/2003	Andrew Dellow	851963.414	4386	
38106 SEED INTELI	7590 05/04/201 LECTUAL PROPERTY	EXAM	EXAMINER		
701 FIFTH AVENUE, SUITE 5400			DEBNATH, SUMAN		
SEATTLE, W.	A 98104-7092	4-7092	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2435		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/04/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/705,782	DELLOW ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SUMAN DEBNATH	2435		

	SUMAN DEBNATH	2435					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 19 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, application, application, application, application, application and the same after a final rejection or of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing							
b) M The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW.							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07().						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (a) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to They raise new issues that would require further cor 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		di calana ay aluun iifi da a si	a laguage for				
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or 	er form for appeal by materially re-	auding or simplifying ti	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmen	et canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliitted iii a separate,	unitery nieu amenumen	it canceling the				
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the company of the compa		I be entered and an e	planation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None.							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>None</u> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
/Kimyen Vu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2435							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in page two of the remark that: "[t]he key register (130) of Ducharme is not a common key store for a decrypted common key."

In response to applicant's argument Examiner asserts that Ducharme discloses the common key is stored in decrypted form in an integrated circuit (col. 2, lines 18-50, col. 3, lines 5-61, see also, col. 4, lines 35-47, col. 5, lines 19-35, col. 7, lines 58-67 and col. 8, lines 20-65; it should be noted that Ducharme discloses a encryption key register 130 (FIG. 1) which teaches the concept of having a common key store in an integrated circuit and/or in a monolithic device); Furthermore, it should be noted that key register resides within a device; thus it's not a smart card. Ducharme stores an encryption key but no where in Ducharme's art was mentioned that encryption key was stored in encrypted form which Applicant is arguing. Ducharme's key register 130 stores encryption key in a decryption form (col. 2, lines 18-50, col. 3, lines 5-61).

Applicant argues that: "Thee element clearly missing from the combination of Ducharme and Mills is the decrypted common key store that stores a plurality of decrypted common keys"

In response to applicant's argument it should be noted that Ducharme teaches a key register which stores encryption key (col. 2, lines 18-50, ool. 3, lines 5-61) which is within a system and not a smart card. Ducharme never mentioned that encryption key had to be in an encrypted form before storing to the key register, thus keys in clear form (i.e. decrypted form) are stored in key register. Further to clarify, anybody with ordinary skill in the art would understand that a key register holds plurality of keys.

Applicant argues that: "Ducharme utilizes a staged decryption of an encrypted control word that is then used to decrypt encrypted data which is only half of what applicants are describing and claiming in the present application"

In response to applicant's argument Examiner asserts that Ducharme's reference was used as a secondary reference to show that encryption key can be stored in clear form within the circuit itself. Miller is a primary reference which was cited for other limitations.